DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 215 HE 011 295

AUTHOR	Hoyt, Donald P.; Spangler, Ronald K.
TITLE	Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head: II. Correlates of Effectiveness. Kansas State University Research Report No. 47.
INSTITUTION	Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE	Jun 78
NOTE	17p.; For related document, see HE 011 294
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Research, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Evaluation; Affective Behavior; *College Faculty; *Department Directors (School); Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership Styles; Research Projects; Social Behavior
IDENTIFIERS	*Competence; *Department Heads

ABSTRACT

A total of 1,333 faculty members from four universities judged the administrative effectiveness of their department head (numbering 103). They also described the department head's behavior by responding to 30 behavioral questions. Through a principal components analysis, four factors were extracted that accounted for 73 percent of the variance in the behavioral descriptions. Measures were developed of the following four administrative styles: democratic practice, structuring, interpersonal sensitivity, and vigor. Relationships between ratings of administrative effectiveness and behavioral descriptions were highly significant. A majority of the 30 behavioral items were correlated significantly with 14 of the 15 performance ratings, but the magnitude of these correlations differed widely among specific item-criterion pairs. Implications are drawn for the selection and professional development of department heads. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171215

Office of Educational Research

Kansas State University

Research Report #47

ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT HEAD:

II. CORRELATES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Donald P. Hoyt and Ronald K. Spangler

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for Faculty Evaluation + Development

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

June 1978

HE 011 295

Abstract

A total of 1333 faculty members from 4 universities judged the administrative effectiveness of their department head (N=103). They also described the department head's behavior by responding to 30 behavioral questions. Through a principal components analysis, four factors were extracted which accounted for 73 percent of the variance in the behavioral descriptions. Measures were developed of these four "Administrative Styles" (Democratic Practice, Structuring, Interpersonal Sensitivity, and Vigor); reliabilities ranged from .86 to .96.

Relationships between ratings of administrative effectiveness and behavioral descriptions were highly significant. A majority of the 30 behavioral items were correlated significantly with 14 of the 15 performance ratings, but the magnitude of these correlations differed widely among specific item-criterion pairs. Similarly, the four measures of "Administrative Style" were significantly related to performance; multiple R's varied from .58 to .81 and averaged .729 (.726 on cross-validation). Structuring and Interpersonal Sensitivity were the best predictors of performance on "Personnel Management" tasks. Activities concerned with "Building Department's Reputation" were best predicted by Vigor and Democratic Practice. Finally, "Planning and Development" effectiveness was predicted best by considering Vigor, Structuring, and Democratic Practice.

Implications were drawn for the selection and professional development of department heads.

Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head
II. Correlates of Effectiveness

In a previous report, Hoyt and Spangler (1977) described a method for evaluating the administrative effectiveness of academic department heads. The procedure required department heads to rate the importance of 15 activities (e.g., guiding procedures for assessing faculty performance; stimulating research and scholarly activity). Faculty members in the department rated both the importance of the activities and the performance of the department head on each. By weighting performance ratings by those for importance, it was possible to obtain overall evaluation indices which reflected the special emphases of each department.

Hoyt and Spangler provided considerable evidence supporting the validity of the proposed evaluation system. It appears to be suitable for summative evaluation. However, to serve formative (improvement) purposes, it would be necessary to discover correlates of effectiveness which are, at least in theory, modifiable. (Dressel, 1976) Such a purpose guided the present investigation.

Two dimensions have consistently emerged in research on leadership styles. The first is primarily related to accomplishment of tasks and generally involves organizational and technical skills. Interpersonal relations comprise the core of the second dimension; concern for personal relationships and work with others is stressed. These dimensions were initially identified by Halpin and Winer (1957) and Hemphill (1955) in conjunction with the Ohio State studies of leadership. They named the two factors "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration". Later studies employing different methodologies in a variety of industrial and military settings confirmed the existence of these dimensions (e.g., Schriesheim, House, and Kerr, 1976; Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, and Stogdill, 1974; Reddin, 1970).

Previous research has found strong positive relationships between measures of both Initiating Structure and Consideration and different measures of effectiveness. Hemphill (1955) reported that both styles were moderately correlated with the reputational ranking of the department. Reddin (1970) modified Fiedler's (1967) model of leadership effectiveness to provide measures of Initiating Structure and Consideration; again, both were related to effectiveness of managers in industrial settings. Other research has supported these conclusions (e.g., Yukl, 1971; Fleishman and Simmons, 1970; Halpin, 1957).

An increased emphasis upon human relations in management has focused attention on Consideration as an administrative style (e.g., McLaughlin et al, 1975; Borrevik, 1972; Siever et al, 1972; Gerber, 1967). Gardener's study of faculty participation in administration (1971) stressed the importance of the interpersonal relationship between the faculty and the department head.

More recent evidence suggests that although Consideration is related to effectiveness, it may not be a necessary condition. House, Filley, & Kerk (1971) found it moderated the effect of Initiating Structure on subordinates' morale in an industrial setting. In a comprehensive review of the literature dealing with Consideration and Initiating Structure, Kerr et al., (1974) also noted some ambiguity in the findings. Graen, Dansereau, and Minami (1972) reported some instances where Consideration was negatively related to effectiveness. Fleishman and Harris (1962, p. 54) offered an explanation which agrees with the Kerr et al. analysis of the conflicting results: "Under 'low Consideration' climates, high Structure is seen as threatening and restrictive by subordinates, but under 'high Consideration' climates this same Structure is seen as supportive and helpful".

McClelland and Burnham (1975) strongly supported such a conclusion, contending that too much emphasis upon interpersonal relations will decrease effectiveness regardless of administrative competence. In an industrial setting, they found that a moderate emphasis on interpersonal relations when combined with administrative skills was substantially more effective than either a high or low emphasis. Such managers were perceived as being fairer than: 1) the "good guy" who wants to stay on friendly terms with everyone or 2) the dedicated manager who will let nothing stand between him and advancement.

From the above, it was determined that it would be desirable to include measures related to "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" in any attempt to find behavioral correlates of administrative effectiveness among academic department heads. Because of the special characteristics of higher education, it seemed desirable to explore the implications of other types of administrative style as well.

Procedure

Instrument

McCarthy (1972) developed a 40-item questionnaire to describe the administrative behavior of department heads. Thirty of these items were taken from Halpin & Winer's (1957) Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LDBQ), a device designed to measure "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration". An additional 10 items were formulated on the basis of Hoyt and Rawson's (1968) study on why faculty members resigned their positions at a large university. A 5-point Likert-type response scale was employed.

On the basis of analyses completed by McCarthy, Hoyt (1976) revised this scale by excluding the 10 items from the LBDQ which were generally unrelated to faculty ratings of the department head's effectiveness. The revision also made modest editorial changes, substituting the word "faculty" for "staff" and exorcising wording which implied "sexism". The 30 items which Hoyt revised and retained from McCarthy's study were selected for this investigation.

The instrument also included a list of the 15 functions which Hoyt and Spangler described (1977). Faculty respondents rated the effectiveness of the head in performing each function, using a 5-point scale.

Sample

Data were collected from four large public universities located in the Plains, Midwest, East, and South. A total of 103 department heads were involved, roughly an equal number from each institution. The number of faculty raters varied from 5 to 30 and averaged 13; the percent of eligible faculty members supplying ratings ranged from 54 to 100 and averaged 82. All ratings were made during the spring term of 1976. In two of the institutions, department heads participated voluntarily; in the other two, a university policy mandated participation.

Analyses

Three major types of analyses were undertaken. The first was a straightforward correlational study in which responses to each of the 30 behavioral questions were related to performance ratings on each of the 15 administrative activities. This study sought to discover specific administrative behaviors which differentiated between department heads who were successful or unsuccessful in a given activity.

The second analysis sought to conceptualize administrative style by performing principal components factor analysis of the average faculty rating on each of the 30 behavioral items. A Varimax rotation was applied.

Finally, the results of the second analysis were used to construct "scales" (sets of items representative of the factors extracted). These were used in multiple regression analyses to determine their potency in predicting performance ratings. A cross-validation using a new sample of 46 department heads was also conducted.

Results

Analysis 1. Table 1 paraphrases the 30 behavioral items and lists their means, standard deviations, and reliabilities. The latter were computed both by Ebel's (1951) intraclass correlation (a relatively conservative estimate) and by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (using an assumed N of 13 raters). Procedural details are supplied in Hoyt and Spangler (1977).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

There was a desirable spread on most of the items. Standard deviations ranged from .46 to .76; all but 6 of the means were between 2.00 and 3.99. Reliabilities of the individual items were also generally acceptable; standard errors ranged from .23 to .40 and averaged .28. Only one standard error exceeded .35.

Average ratings on each administrative behavior item were correlated with those on each performance item. A summary of the correlational

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Faculty Ratings of Behaviors
(N = 103 Departments)

Behavior	Mean	S. D.	Reliability S-B*	Reliability I-Class
1. Makes own attitudes clear.	3.96	.53	.78	.68
2. Tries out new ideas with fac.	3.59	.59	.80	.67
(3.) Works without a plan.	1.93	.61	.77	.59
4. Maintains standards of perf.	3.69	.53	.73	.59
5. Makes role understood by all.	3.73	.55	.71	.59
6. Lets fac. know what's expected.	3.66	.54	.73	.62
7. Sees that fac. work to capacity.	3.36	.54	.69	.56
8. Sees that fac. work is coord.	3.30	.61	.80	.68
9. Does little things to please.	3.50	.76	.79	.74
10. Is easy to understand.	3.91	.68	.79	.76
(11.) Keeps to him/herself.	2.31	.68	.89	.74
12. Looks out for psnl wlfr of fac.	3.65	.64	.77	.64
(13.) Refuses to explain actions.	1.66	.53	.81	.66
(14.) Acts without consulting fac.	2.13	.57	.80	.66
(15.) Slow to accept new ideas.	2.03	.67	.86	.78
16. Treats all faculty as equals.	3.95	.73	.81	.75
17. Is willing to make changes.	3.98	.55	.78	.71
18. Puts fac. at ease in convers.	4.12	.63	.71	.72
19. Puts fac. sugg. into action.	3.64	.46	.75	.64
20. Gets fac. appr. on imp. matters.	3.96	.61	.82	.73
(21.) Postpones dec. unnecessarily.	1.79	.58	.80	.69
(22.) More a reactor than initiator.	2.39	.73	.85	.76
23. Welcomes fac. sugg. about dept.	4.15	.62	.77	.70
(24.) Responds to faculty clique.	2.03	.67	.64	.61
25. Makes allowance for fac. probs.	3.96	.52	.73	.59
26. Acknowledges good work.	3.63	.63	.78	.65
27. Explains decisions.	3.94	.53	.77	.64
28. Gains fac input on imp. matters.	4.14	.46	.72	.56
29. Stresses dept's accomplishments.	3.89	.52	.78	.57
30. Stresses faculty morale.	3.66	.71	.77	.72

Note: Items in ( ) are negatively worded.

*Split-half correlation adjusted by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula.

findings is presented in Table 2. It confirms the fact that faculty descriptions of administrative behavior were substantially related to faculty ratings of administrative effectiveness.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

While this overlap undoubtedly reflects the halo effect characteristic of ratings of this type, faculty raters appeared to exercise a degree of discrimination in making their judgments. For example, while 18 of the behavioral items correlated over .60 with Criterion I ("Maintaining faculty morale by reducing, resolving, or preventing conflicts"), Item 29 ("Acts as though visible department accomplishments were vital to him/her") correlated only .38 with this criterion. Item 3 ("Works without a plan") correlated about .65 with two "Planning" criteria ("Guides development of sound organizational plan to accomplish department program" and "Guides curriculum development"), but correlated only .25 with "Facilitates obtaining grants and contracts from extramural sources". In brief, the degree of relationship between each behavioral item and the criteria varied sufficiently among items and criterion ratings to suggest that something more than a simple halo effect was at work.

Analysis 2. A principal components analysis was undertaken of the mean ratings of each item for the 103 department heads. Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were found on the first four factors. A Varimax rotation was performed, resulting in the factor loadings shown in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The first factor accounted for 50.8 percent of the variance. Items loading heaviest on this factor appeared to describe "Democratic Practice", the name given to it. Factor II obviously emphasized the "Structuring" items from the LBDQ and it was named accordingly. The third factor clearly overlapped with the first; factor loadings were only slightly nigher on Factor III than on Factor I. Still, the factor accounted for an additional 6.1 percent of the variance. It was named "Interpersonal Sensitivity", since its items focused on one-to-one interaction, as opposed to the more general democratic policies incorporated in Factor 1. Factors I and III together appear to encompass the "Consideration" factor which has been so prevalently mentioned in the literature. Finally, the fourth factor, accounting for 4.1 percent of the variance, contained four items which have in common a concern for action; accordingly, this factor was named "Vigor".

Analysis 3. Scales were developed to represent the four factors identified in the preceding analysis. The items loading heaviest on each factor constituted the four scales; responses to these items were summed, with negatively worded items being scored in reverse. Basic descriptive statistics for these scales are summarized in Table 4.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Table 2

Correlations Between Mean Ratings of Performance
and of Administrative Behaviors
(N = 103 Departments)

Behavior No.	Performance*														
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1.	-	43	40	44	-	-	-	-	54	47	58	45	-	44	45
2.	49	49	64	51	56	60	57	66	58	53	56	66	48	64	48
(3)	-47	-47	-68	-52	-48	-52	-42	-64	-	-44	-42	-50	-	-52	-
4.	54	57	58	55	46	64	46	48	51	45	53	46	-	59	53
5.	61	61	63	57	-	60	46	50	59	65	72	64	-	58	58
6.	63	63	63	59	42	56	46	48	54	60	60	54	-	52	55
7.	53	54	59	54	46	57	40	52	40	57	58	59	-	52	58
8.	57	61	75	65	54	67	61	60	57	72	69	63	-	63	72
9.	59	64	53	57	-	59	46	-	78	64	40	41	-	55	42
10.	61	63	53	56	-	62	49	47	82	56	58	57	-	61	42
(11)	-44	-41	-	-	-	-45	-43	-	-64	-48	-	-44	-	-48	-
12.	54	68	56	61	46	60	50	45	71	68	-	59	49	57	44
(13)	-44	-54	-46	-50	-	-47	-47	-	-74	-52	-47	-55	-42	-53	-
(14)	-40	-52	-50	-47	-	-50	-45	-41	-66	-54	-47	-43	-	-49	-
(15)	-48	-48	-56	-	-51	-54	-63	-50	-60	-52	-40	-61	-53	-63	-
16.	45	58	47	52	40	49	44	-	77	57	41	41	-	54	-
17.	48	58	55	47	45	49	57	48	64	52	42	59	49	60	-
18.	50	54	41	46	-	46	43	-	78	55	43	45	-	50	-
19.	55	66	64	56	45	58	52	49	72	67	56	62	44	64	46
20.	-	50	52	50	-	51	-	-	64	53	47	-	-	44	-
(21)	-55	-49	-64	-56	-46	-58	-54	-55	-49	-51	-58	-66	-	-69	-43
(22)	-54	-50	-58	-45	-58	-50	-61	-62	-48	-48	-47	-70	-58	-69	-
23.	49	52	58	50	46	55	53	43	73	58	49	59	45	59	-
(24)	-	-	-45	-50	-	-42	-41	-	-51	-53	-	-	-	-46	-53
25.	41	47	42	49	45	47	-	-	66	57	42	41	43	46	48
26.	58	63	52	44	-	52	55	-	62	63	47	47	44	55	-
27.	52	59	61	60	49	56	54	48	75	61	64	60	40	62	49
28.	40	52	52	51	40	48	45	40	70	60	53	47	-	53	41
29.	50	41	53	40	46	40	46	43	-	40	47	52	-	52	-
30.	66	66	64	59	52	66	56	52	84	64	59	61	-	70	48

Note: Decimals omitted; - means correlation was between -.39 and +.39.

* A = Guides faculty evaluation procedures.
B = Rewards faculty appropriately.
C = Guides organization & planning.
D = Allocates faculty responsibility.
E = Faculty recruitment.
F = Fosters good teaching.
G = Stim. research/scholarly activity.
H = Guides curriculum development.
I = Maintains faculty morale.
J = Fosters faculty development.
K = Communicates U expectations.
L = Communicates dept's needs.
M = Facil. extramural funding.
N = Improves dept's image.
O = Encourages balace in dept.

Table 3

Factor Loadings for Average Faculty Ratings of Behavior
(N=103 Departments)
-Varimax Rotation-

Behaviors	Rotated Factor Loadings for Factor: I	II	III	IV
(14) Acts without consulting faculty	-.88	-.16	-.15	-.07
20. Gets faculty approval on important matters	.88	.24	.18	-.03
28. Gains faculty input on important issues	.85	.20	.27	.10
16. Treats all faculty as equal	.82	.03	.41	.12
(13) Refuses to explain actions	-.78	-.02	-.30	-.30
23. Welcomes faculty suggestions about department	.72	.13	.40	.31
27. Explains decisions	.71	.32	.36	.28
17. Is willing to make changes	.62	-.01	.28	.57
19. Puts faculty suggestions into action	.61	.25	.36	.38
(15) Slow to accept new ideas	-.61	.08	-.23	-.53
(24) Responds to a faculty clique	-.58	-.19	-.15	-.25
10. Is easy to understand	.55	.28	.50	.20
5. Makes role understood by all	.30	.74	.38	.23
6. Lets faculty know what's expected of them	.21	.73	.29	.26
8. Sees that faculty work is coordinated	.30	.70	.26	.32
7. Sees that faculty work to capacity	.09	.69	.23	.39
4. Maintains standards of performance	.31	.56	.14	.28
1. Makes own attitudes clear	.28	.44	.43	.20
(3) Works without a plan	-.36	-.43	.08	-.41
9. Does little things to please	.54	.17	.65	.07
18. Puts faculty at ease in conversation	.62	-.01	.63	.10
(11) Keeps to him/herself	-.36	-.05	-.62	-.30
30. Stresses faculty morale	.51	.26	.62	.33
26. Acknowledges good work	.39	.30	.59	.23
25. Makes allowances for faculty problems	.54	.09	.55	.18
12. Looks out for personal welfare of faculty	.48	.18	.51	.27
(22) More a reactor than an initiator	-.11	-.22	-.24	-.86
2. Tries out new ideas with the faculty	.36	.24	.21	.72
(21) Postpones decisions unnecessarily	-.23	-.48	-.11	-.56
29. Stresses departmental accomplishments	.08	.26	.38	.49

Factor	Eigen Value	% of Variance Accounted For
1	16.76	50.8
2	3.94	12.0
3	2.01	6.1
4	1.36	4.1
Total		73.0

Note: Items in ( ) are negatively worded.

Table 4

Inter-correlations and Reliabilities of Factor Scores

(N=103 Departments)

	Intercorrelations of Factor Scores				Number of Items Included	Reliability [a]	Mean	S.D.
	I	II	III	IV				
I					12	.96	47.81	5.96
II	.63				7	.90	25.78	3.12
III	.85	.62			7	.93	26.22	3.87
IV	.59	.73	.60		4	.86	15.30	2.06

[a] Reliability was determined by Cronbach's coefficient alpha (1951).

Intercorrelations were undesirably high. As expected, that between Factors I and III was extremely high (.85). Yet none was as high as the reliabilities as estimated by coefficient alpha. Therefore, it was decided to retain all four scores for the next phase of the study.

Multiple regression procedures were employed using the four factor scores as independent variables. Fifteen stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed; the average performance rating for a given function served as the dependent variable in each case.

Table 5 shows the significant beta weights and associated zero order correlations. Also shown is the multiple correlation resulting from optimally combining the significant predictors.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

scores and performance ratings. The multiple correlations ranged from .58 to .87 and averaged .73. For all but one of the functions, 40 percent or more of the variance was accounted for by variation in style scores. Even for the exception, "Facilitates extramural funding", over a third of the variance was explained.

The pattern of relationships depicted in Table 5 merits special study. "Structuring" (Factor II) was critical in performing "Personnel Management" tasks; it also contributed to prediction of effectiveness on some "Planning" tasks. Factor IV, "Vigor", was relevant to all four activities associated with improving the department's image and reputation, but made no independent contribution to the prediction of performance on personnel management tasks. "Interpersonal Sensitivity" (Factor III) was also related primarily to effectiveness as a personnel manager; on three of the six functions included in this area, it combined with the "Structuring" score to produce the optimal regression equation. Factor I, "Democratic Practice", added significantly to the prediction of 9 (out of 15) criteria, 3 in each of the broad areas of responsibility assumed by department heads.

An opportunity to cross-validate these regression equations occurred in the Spring semester of 1977 when 46 additional department heads from three of the original institutions participated. Zero order correlations were computed between the performance scores predicted by the multiple regression equations and those computed from faculty ratings. The average cross-validation correlation was .726, compared to an average of .729 for the original multiple Rs. All 15 cross-validation coefficients were within .11 of the original Rs.

Discussion

Generalization of these results to higher education as a whole or to any particular segment of it is unwarranted, since neither participating institutions nor department heads were randomly selected to represent a known population. However, those in large and complex institutions can reasonably expect that these findings will be applicable. Further study of their use in other types of institutions (i.e., small private colleges; community-junior colleges) is desirable.

Table 5

Relationships of Factor Scores to Performance Ratings
for 15 Administrative Functions

(N=103 Departments)

Performance Functions	Administrative Style I B	I r	II B	II r	III B	III r	IV B	IV r	R
Personnel Management									
1. Guides faculty evaluation procedures			.46	.67	.33	.62			.72
2. Rewards faculty appropriately			.43	.69	.42	.68			.76
4. Allocates faculty responsibilities	.27	.60	.52	.69					.72
9. Maintains faculty morale	.32	.82			.58	.85			.87
10. Fosters faculty development			.42	.70	.44	.71			.78
11. Communicates university expectations	.18	.57	.62	.73					.75
Planning and Development									
3. Guides organization and planning	.18	.63	.47	.76			.25	.70	.81
5. Faculty recruitment	.21	.50					.49	.61	.64
6. Fosters good teaching			.50	.71	.32	.64			.75
8. Guides curriculum development	.32	.64					.44	.67	.71
15. Encourages balance among specializations			.68	.68					.68
Building Department's Reputation									
7. Stimulates research/ scholarly activity	.30	.58					.47	.65	.69
12. Communicates department's needs	.17	.60	.21	.68			.50	.78	.79
13. Facilitates extramural funding					.23	.47	.41	.54	.58
14. Improves department's image	.33	.66					.56	.75	.69

Note: All results shown are significant at or beyond the .05 level of probability.

The "halo effect" probably accounted for the substantial relationships found among all faculty ratings. Nonetheless, there was considerable evidence that the raters exercised some discrimination in making their judgments. The predictive potency of individual items varied considerably among the 15 criteria; and the most potent predictors tended to vary from one criterion to the next.

Four interrelated dimensions of administrative style emerged. Two of these -- "Democratic Practice" and "Interpersonal Sensitivity" -- appeared to duplicate the "Consideration" factor reported in the literature on administration. "Structuring" was also similar to a leadership factor found in other settings. "Vigor", the final factor, had not been previously identified. While it may represent an administrative style unique to higher education, it seems more likely that previous studies had simply omitted questions related to this dimension. Three of the four items which defined this factor were not included in the original LBDQ.

Multiple regression analyses suggested that different qualities are "needed" for effectively performing different administrative functions. Personnel Management functions were related to "Structuring" and either "Interpersonal Sensitivity" or "Democratic Practice". Functions concerned with building the department's reputation were most closely related to "Vigor", while "Democratic Practice" played a less important, though significant, role. The effectiveness with which planning functions were conducted was related to various combinations of all four administrative styles.

Given the relatively strong relationships between administrative behaviors (both individual items and factor scores) and effectiveness ratings, the results should be helpful in selecting department heads and in assisting those already appointed to improve their administrative effectiveness. In terms of selection, it would clearly be helpful to identify the activities which are most crucial to the situation in question. If faculty evaluation and development constitutes a major concern, emphasis might be placed on the candidates' ability to provide structure and interpersonal sensitivity; if improving "visibility" is stressed, evidence of vigor and commitment to democratic practice would be more relevant.

Results from this study should also be useful in an improvement program. Ratings of effectiveness, combined with ratings of importance, can be used to identify the particular functions where improvement is most needed. Correlational results (items and scales) could then be used to identify relevant administrative techniques. By comparing faculty ratings for the department head in question with the "normative" data provided in Tables 1 and 4, it should be possible to detect the particular techniques or approaches which, if altered, would likely result in improved performance.

Future research is needed to establish the feasibility of these suggestions as well as to determine the applicability of the findings to other types of institutions. In addition, it is desirable to examine "extraneous conditions" which may be related to the effectiveness of department heads (e.g., percent of tenured faculty, retrenchment pressures, facilities) since, in all personnel evaluation efforts, it is important to separate the impact of the person from that of the situation.

REFERENCES

Aldomon, H. F. Critical behavior requirements of heads of departments. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1960, 20, 3138A.

Aleamoni, L. M. & Hexner, P. Z. The Effects of different sets of instructions on student course and instructor evaluation. Research Report No. 339. Urbana, Illinois: Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois, 1973.

Blau, P. M. & Scott, R. Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Campbell, R. G. & Gregg, R. T., Eds. Administrative behavior in higher education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Copeland, B. Jr. Faculty perception of the professional role of the administrator of the academic department. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1975.

Dressel, P. L., Johnson, F. C., & Marcus, P. M. The confidence crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Dressel, P. L. & Reichard, D. J. The university department: Retrospect and prospect". Journal of Higher Education, 1970, 41, 387-402.

Ebel, R. L. Esimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1957, 16 (4), 407-424.

Erickson, D. A. & Pederson, K. G. Major Communication problems in the schools. Administrator's Notebook, 1966, 14, 1-4.

Faricy, W. H. Grouping departments. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45, 98-111.

Gerber, J. "The chairman and his department. Paper presented at the Association of Departments of English, New York, October, 1967.

Henry, D. D. The academic department and academic change. Management Forum, 1974, 2 (3); 1-4.

Hoyt, D. P. Interpreting faculty ratings of the academic chairperson/head (2nd Revision). Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Office of Educational Resources, 1976.

Hoyt, D. P. & Spangler, R. K. Administrative effectiveness of the academic department head: I. The Measurement of effectiveness. Research Report #42, Office of Educational Research. Manhattan, Ks: Kansas State University, 1977.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale. In Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.), Group dynamics: research and theory, Evanston, Ill.: Row & Peterson, 1969.

References, continued:

Levy, A. The effects of stated purpose and timing of course evaluation questionnaires on student responses. Unpublished master's thesis, McGill University, 1976.

McCarthy, M. J. Correlates of effectiveness among academic department heads. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1972.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant universities. Research in Higher Education, 1975, 3(3), 243-260.

Metty, M. P. The departmental chairman and the public institution. Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Roach, J. H. L. The academic department chairperson: functions and responsibilities. Educational Record, 1976, 57, 13-23.

Scott, W. W. & Spaulding, L. F. What do we know about leadership? Columbia, S.C.: State Committee for Technical Education, 1972.

Siever, R. G. The role and function of academic department chairmen in two land-grand institutions. Colorado State University: CO. Neidt and Ross Loomis Human Factors Research Laboratory, 1969.

Siever, R. G., Loomis, R. J., & Neidt, C. O. Role perceptions of department chairmen in Two Land-Grant Universities. Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 65(9), 405-410.